



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,364	02/23/2004	James E. Greenwood	37861-193972	8973
23122	7590	07/02/2008	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			NORMAN, SAMICAL	
P O BOX 980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			3696	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/02/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/785,364	Applicant(s) GREENWOOD ET AL.
	Examiner Samica L. Norman	Art Unit 3696

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-57 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 51, 52, 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

3. Regarding claim 51. Claim 51 recites the limitation “wherein: the data from the loan policy system and the risk data system includes data derived after perfection of the loan, as post-perfection data; and the risk system includes a risk rule engine for comparing the post-perfection data with the loan policy to generate a risk event.”

4. Regarding claim 54. Claim 54 recites the limitation “wherein the risk system generates different levels of risk events by comparing the data from the loan policy system and the risk data system with the loan policy such that at least one of the different levels of the risk events causes the risk management system to operate in a different mode from the remaining ones of the different levels of the risk events.”

5. Regarding claim 55. Claim 55 recites the limitation “wherein the different levels of the risk events include: (1) a first level in which the risk management system operates to reject the loan based one or more deviations of the data from the loan policy system and the risk data system with the loan policy, and (2) a second level in which the risk management system generates an alert that the loan deviates from the loan policy.”

6. Regarding claim 56. Claim 56 recites the limitation “wherein responsive to a risk event of the second level being overridden by a user, the risk management system stores information identifying the risk event of the second level and at least one of information of the user or a corresponding override event.”

7. Regarding claim 57. Claim 57 recites the limitation “wherein the loan policy includes one or more rules based on a composite exposure of a lender for a portfolio of loans to the borrower and to other borrowers of the lender to generate a risk event based on a deviation from the loan policy.”

8. The specification does not describe the claimed limitations as recited in the amended claims. Furthermore, applicant has not provided in the submitted Remarks where this phrase can be found in the specification. The listed areas do not contain the newly added limitations.

9. Claim 52 contains the same deficiencies as claim 51 through dependency and, as such, are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5, 12-16, 25, 27-30, 32, 34, 43-48, 50 and 53 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Terashima et al., U.S. PG- Pub No. 2003/0065600
(reference A on the attached PTO-892 document).

3. As per claim 1, Terashima et al. teaches a risk management system for assessing a risk of a loan to a borrower, comprising: a. a loan policy system comprising a loan policy, the loan policy comprising a set of rules (see paragraph 0076, lines 1-4); b. at least one risk data system in communication with the loan policy system (see paragraph 0075); c. a risk system in communication with the loan policy system and the risk data system, the risk system adapted to process data from the loan policy system and the risk data system for the purpose of performing risk assessment regarding the loan to the borrower; and (see paragraph 0009, lines 2-6), d. a user interface in communication with the risk system for reporting the result of the risk assessment (see paragraph 0067, lines 5-7).

4. As per claim 2, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk system further comprises a risk rule engine for performing the risk assessment, the risk rule engine in communication with the loan policy system and the risk data system (see paragraph 0088, lines 1-7).

5. As per claim 3, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 2 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk system further comprises a risk analysis file, the risk analysis file in communication with the risk rule engine, the risk analysis file adapted to process and store data for risk assessment (see paragraph 0090, lines 1-3).

6. As per claim 4, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk data system comprises an exception system (see paragraph 0010, lines 10-14).

7. As per claim 5, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk data system comprises an origination system (see paragraph 0010, lines 1-10).

8. As per claim 12, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 3 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk analysis file further comprises a risk calculator repository (see paragraphs 0090-0099).

9. As per claim 13, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 3 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk analysis file further comprises an analysis rule repository (see paragraph 0076, lines 1-4 and paragraph 0054, lines 5-8).

10. As per claim 14, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 3 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk analysis file further comprises an action rule repository (see paragraph 0086).

11. As per claim 15, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 14 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the action rule repository further comprises a notification routine (see paragraph 0087).

12. As per claim 16, as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach claim 14 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the action rule repository further comprises an action routine (see paragraph 0062).
13. As per claim 25, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 3 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk analysis file further comprises an exception repository (see paragraph 0113, lines 1-6).
14. As per claim 27, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 2 as described above. Terashima et al. teaches wherein the risk system further comprises an event monitor in communication with the risk rule engine and the risk data system (see paragraph 0102).
15. As per claim 28, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 2 as described above. Terashima et al. teaches wherein the risk system further comprises an event filter in communication with the risk rule engine and the risk data system (see paragraph 0104).
16. As per claim 29, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 2 as described above. Terashima et al. teaches wherein the risk system further comprises an inquiry dispatcher in communication with the risk rule engine and the risk data system (see paragraph 0121).
17. As per claim 30, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches at least one system interface in communication with the risk data system and the risk system (see paragraph 0067, lines 5-7).
18. As per claim 32, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 30 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the system interface comprises an exception interface (see paragraph 0019).

19. As per claim 34, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 30 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the system interface comprises an origination interface (see paragraph 0019 and paragraph 0010, lines 1-10).

20. As per claim 43, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches a user interface in communication with the risk rule engine (see paragraph 0067, lines 5-7).

21. As per claim 44, Terashima et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 43 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the user interface is a risk workstation (see paragraph 0062, lines 1-6).

22. As per claim 45, Terashima et al. teaches a method for assessing risk of a loan to a borrower, comprising: a. establishing a loan policy for the loan between a lender and a borrower (see paragraph 0010); b. monitoring data in at least one risk data system (see paragraph 0082); c. comparing the data to the loan policy in order to determine if the data deviates from the loan policy (see paragraph 0085); d. recording a risk event when the data deviates from the loan policy (see paragraph 0085); e. performing risk assessment of the risk event (see paragraph 0088, lines 1-7); and, f. enabling a user to access the results of the risk assessment regarding the loan to the borrower (see paragraph 0088, lines 9-12).

23. As per claim 46, Terashima et al. teaches the method of claim 45 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk event is assessed via a risk system (see Abstract, lines 6-16).

24. As per claim 47, Terashima et al. teaches the method of claim 46 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk system is a computer program implemented on

at least one computer and adapted to automatically review the risk data system for occurrence of risk events (see paragraph 0009, lines 2-6).

25. As per claim 48, Terashima et al. teaches the method of claim 46 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk system automatically performs the risk assessment (see paragraphs 0055 and 0056).

26. As per claim 50, Terashima et al. teaches the method of claim 45 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein a user is enabled to access the results of the risk assessment via a risk workstation (see paragraph 0062, lines 1-6 and paragraph 0088, lines 9-12).

27. As per claim 53, Terashima et al. teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the risk system generates risk events based on the data from the loan policy system and the risk data system and the risk management system stores the generated risk events (see paragraph 0088, lines 1-7 and paragraph 0090, lines 1-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. Claims 6-10, 17-24, 26, 31, 39-41 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima et al., U.S. PG- Pub No. 2003/0065600 (reference A on the

attached PTO-892 document) in view of Russell et al., U.S. PG-Pub No. 2002/019412 (reference B on the attached PTO-892).

30. As per claim 6, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk data system comprises a loan accounting system. Russell et al. teaches wherein the risk data system comprises a loan accounting system (see paragraph 0022, lines 12-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of expediting the financial services application, approval and origination process (see paragraph 0022, lines 21-29 of Russell et al.).

31. As per claim 7, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk data system comprises a deposit system. Russell et al. teaches wherein the risk data system comprises a deposit system (see paragraph 0060, lines 10-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of having the ability to supply financial information only one time (see paragraph 0058, lines 6-18 of Russell et al.).

32. As per claim 8, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk data system comprises an external rating system. Russell et al. teaches wherein the risk data system comprises a loan accounting system (see paragraph 0022, lines 12-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 3696

at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of expediting the financial services application, approval and origination process (see paragraph 0022, lines 21-29 of Russell et al.).

33. As per claim 9, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk data system comprises a covenants system. However, it is well known in the art for a lender to have a system to process and store the loan agreements that are made with the borrower. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate this feature for the purpose of keeping track of loan agreements for legal purposes.

34. As per claim 10, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk data system comprises an account analysis system. Russell et al. teaches wherein the risk data system comprises an account analysis system (see paragraph 0036, lines 11-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of expediting the financial services application, approval and origination process (see paragraph 0022, lines 21-29 of Russell et al.).

35. As per claim 17, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 14 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the action rule repository further comprises an exposure routine. Russell et al. teaches wherein the action rule repository further comprises an exposure routine (see paragraph 0049, lines 12-25). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of being responsive to a customers' evolving needs (see paragraph 0049, lines 1-8 of Russell et al.).

36. As per claim 18, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 3 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk analysis file further comprises a scheduled analysis repository. However, it is well known in the art to make a schedule of payments for a borrower. It would have been obvious to incorporate this feature for the purpose of obligating the customer to make payments towards their loan.

37. As per claim 19, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 3 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk analysis file further comprises a risk policy repository. Russell et al. teaches wherein the risk analysis file further comprises a risk policy repository (see paragraph 0020, lines 16-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of streamlining and optimizing the evaluation and presentation of financial products (see paragraph 0020, lines 20-23 of Russell et al.).

38. As per claim 20, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 3 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk analysis file further comprises an exposure repository. Russell et al. teaches wherein the risk analysis file further comprises an exposure repository (see paragraph 0048, lines 26-30 and paragraph 0049, lines 12-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this

feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of being responsive to a customers' evolving needs (see paragraph 0049, lines 1-8 of Russell et al.).

39. As per claim 21, Terashima et al. in view of Russell et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 20 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the exposure repository further comprises an interim calculations routine (see paragraph 0108, lines 6-9).

40. As per claim 22, Terashima et al. in view of Russell et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 20 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the exposure repository further comprises a summarizations routine (see paragraphs 0124-0125).

41. As per claim 23, Terashima et al. in view of Russell et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 20 as described above. Terashima et al. in view of Russell et al. does not explicitly disclose wherein the exposure repository further comprises a timestamped data routine. However, the timestamped data routine does not relate back to or clarifies what is required by the claims. The wherein clauses of claim 18 merely states the result of a limitation in the claims and is therefore given little patentable weight. *See Texas Instruments Inc. v. International Trade Commission*, 26 USPQ2d 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Griffin v. Bertina*, 62 USPQ2d 1431 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Amazon.com Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com Inc.*, 57 USPQ2d 1747 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

42. As per claim 24, Terashima et al. in view of Russell et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 20 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches wherein the exposure repository further comprises a risk action status routine (see paragraph 0120).

43. As per claim 26, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 3 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk analysis file further comprises a covenants

repository. However, it is well known in the art for a lender to have a system to process and store the loan agreements that are made with the borrower. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate this feature for the purpose of keeping track of loan agreements for legal purposes.

44. As per claim 31, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 30 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the system interface comprises a covenants interface. However, it is well known in the art for a lender to have a system to process and store the loan agreements that are made with the borrower. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate this feature for the purpose of keeping track of loan agreements for legal purposes.

45. As per claim 39, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 2 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk system further comprises a transaction submission module in communication with the risk rule engine and the risk data system. Russell et al. teaches wherein the risk system further comprises a transaction submission module in communication with the risk rule engine and the risk data system (see paragraph 0036, lines 17-27 and paragraph 0037). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of being able to make changes to a loan in a timely fashion.

46. As per claim 40, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 2 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk system further comprises a risk workflow engine in communication with the risk rule engine and the risk data system. Russell et al.

teaches wherein the risk system further comprises a risk workflow engine in communication with the risk rule engine and the risk data system (see paragraph 0030). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of receiving, transmitting, and displaying customer and provider requests (see paragraph 0030, lines 4-8 of Russell et al.).

47. As per claim 41, Terashima et al. in view of Russell et al. teaches the risk management system of claim 40 as described above. Terashima et al. further teaches a notification engine in communication with the risk workflow engine (see paragraph 0087).

48. As per claim 49, Terashima et al. teaches the method of claim 45 as described above. Terashima et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the step of performing the risk assessment of the risk event further comprises comparing the data comprising the risk event to data from a second risk data system. The Examiner notes, altering the number of risk data systems does not modify the method of managing risk. To have modified Terashima et al. to have included various numbers of risk data systems would have been obvious to the skilled artisan because the inclusion of such a step would have been an obvious matter of design choice in light of the method already disclosed by Terashima et al. (see paragraph 0009, lines 2-6). Such modification would not have otherwise affected Terashima et al. and would have merely represented one of numerous steps that the skilled artisan would have found obvious for the purposes already disclosed by Ref. Additionally, applicant has not persuasively demonstrated the criticality of having two risk data systems versus any other number. See *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

49. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima et al., U.S. PG- Pub No. 2003/0065600 (reference A on the attached PTO-892 document) in view of Regan, U.S. Patent No. 6,898,574 (reference C on the attached PTO-892).

50. As per claim 11, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 1 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the risk data system comprises a recovery system. Regan teaches wherein the risk data system comprises a recovery system (see column 9, lines 9-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of to follow up with the recovery process (see column 9, lines 16-20 of Regan).

51. Claims 33, 35-38 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima et al., U.S. PG- Pub No. 2003/0065600 (reference A on the attached PTO-892 document) in view of Lawrence et al., U.S. PG-Pub No. 2002/0138407 (reference D on the attached PTO-892).

52. As per claim 33, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 30 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the system interface comprises a loan accounting interface. Lawrence et al. teaches wherein the system interface comprises a loan accounting interface (see paragraph 0058). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of presenting information (see paragraph 0058, lines 1-3 of Lawrence et al.).

53. As per claim 35, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 30 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the system interface comprises a trust interface. Lawrence et al. teaches wherein the system interface comprises a trust interface (see paragraph 0058). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of presenting information (see paragraph 0058, lines 1-3 of Lawrence et al.).

54. As per claim 36, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 30 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the system interface comprises a deposit interface. Lawrence et al. teaches wherein the system interface comprises a deposit interface (see paragraph 0058). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of presenting information (see paragraph 0058, lines 1-3 of Lawrence et al.).

55. As per claim 37, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 30 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the system interface comprises a live datafeed interface. Lawrence et al. teaches wherein the system interface comprises a live datafeed interface (see paragraph 0058). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of presenting information (see paragraph 0058, lines 1-3 of Lawrence et al.).

56. As per claim 38, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 30 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach wherein the system interface comprises a third party interface. Lawrence et al. teaches wherein the system interface comprises a third party interface (see paragraph 0058). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of presenting information (see paragraph 0058, lines 1-3 of Lawrence et al.).

57. As per claim 42, Terashima et al. teaches the risk data system of claim 40 as described above. Terashima et al. fails to teach a risk action joblist system in communication with the risk workflow engine. Lawrence et al. teaches a risk action joblist system in communication with the risk workflow engine (see paragraph 0031). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Terashima et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of being notified when an account reaches or exceeds a threshold (see paragraph 0031, lines 1-2 of Lawrence et al.).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 2, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Terashima fails to disclose a loan policy system or loan

policy. Terashima discloses a risk system involving financial instruments. By definition a financial instrument is a document showing that money has been lent or borrowed, invested or passed from one account to another, e.g. a bill of exchange, share certificate, certificate of deposit, an IOU. Similarly **relative terms** in claims are given **broadest reasonable interpretation** during patent applications prosecution. *In re Heck*, 216 USPQ 1038 (CA FC 1983).

Conclusion

58. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

59. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

60. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Honarvar et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,430,545 (reference E on the attached PTO-892),

Art Unit: 3696

teaches a rules based decision management system using online analytical processing technology for dynamic assessment of strategy results. O'Brien et al., U.S. PG-Pub No. 2003/0163414 (reference F on the attached PTO-892), teaches a computerized systems and methods for initiation, creating, managing, and scrutinizing loans and other credit programs electronically.

61. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samica L. Norman whose telephone number is (571)270-1371. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30a-4p, w/ 1st Fri off & 2nd 6:30a-3p.

62. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

63. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

sln